DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 558 SP 019 335

AUTHOR Harder, Martha
TITLE Faculty Productivity in Colleges/Schools of Education.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 43p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Rank (Professional); College Faculty; Decision Making; Educational Researchers; *Evaluation Criteria; Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Noninstructional Responsibility; *Productivity; Retrenchment; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Educators; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Promotion; Teacher Salaries; Tenure

ABSTRACT

The results of a survey of 65 colleges of education on how they evaluated the productivity of their faculty are reported. Most of the responding institutions agreed with a definition of productivity as the sum of all activities which are related either directly or indirectly to professional duties, responsibilities, and interests. The 21 doctoral degree-granting colleges indicated a slightly higher amount of concern about the level and evaluation of faculty productivity than did the other institutions. The data are organized into four broad areas. In the section on teaching loads, full-time teaching loads, indexing teaching loads, workload specifications, and off-campus teaching are covered. Information dealing with productivity calculations included faculty classifications, productivity aggregation, and frequency of data gathering. A section on factors in decision making elicited responses on the importance of teaching, research, service, merit evaluations, and estimations of productivity. A section on methods being used to increase faculty productivity lists the ten general categories mentioned most frequently. Twenty conclusions based on the findings are summarized. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212558

FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

IN

COLLEGES/SCHOOLS OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Spring, 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Dr. Martha Harder

Division of Administrative
and Educational Services

Virginia Tech

Blacksburg, Virginia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Martha B. Harder

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP 019 335

INTRODUCTION

During the Spring of 1981, in an attempt to gather information concerning faculty productivity practices and policies, a questionnaire was sent to 300 Colleges and/or Schools of Education across the nation. These institutions represented approximately one-third of the membership list provided by the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education selected at random. Completed questionnaires were received from 65 colleges, representing a return rate of 22%. Several questionnaires and/or letters were received indicating that the institution had only a department of education, the institution was so small that the questionnaire could not be completed, or the questionnaire was not relevant. No mail follow-up was conducted, although telephone calls were made to ten of the non-responding institutions in an attempt to determine why they had not responded. Each of the institutions stated that they did not respond for the following reasons: time constraints, the questionnaire was too long, or there had been a change in personnel. After considering the reasons for non-responses, the determination was made to use the answers of the 65 responding institutions for the report. Of these 65 colleges, 24 were doctoral granting institutions and 41 were non-doctoral granting institutions. Thirty-four states and Puerto Rico were represented in the respondents.

The analysis of the data was accomplished by calculating frequencies and percentages of responses. Crosstabulations were made to see if

responses differed significantly between the doctoral and non-doctoral colleges. Any significances (at .05 level) found are discussed within the report where applicable.

Concern of Faculty Productivity:

Over three-fourths of the respondents (77.6%) indicated that the level of faculty productivity is a concern at their institution and 86% responded that the evaluation of faculty productivity is also a concern. Doctoral granting colleges indicated a slightly higher level of concern in both areas than did those colleges which do not grant doctoral degrees. The perceived primary sources of concern for the level of faculty productivity in both types of colleges were college/university administration and state council/legislation. The college/university administration was viewed by both as the primary source of concern as it related to the evaluation of faculty productivity, with the method of evaluation ranking in second place. Also listed were faculty rank and funding, as well as concern from the faculty itself. In addition, some of the individual comments made were:

- Because of declining resources, each college must describe faculty productivity better, and compete with all other university needs when any faculty position becomes vacant.
- Potentially productive scholars and teachers may be lost to the university when untenured faculty do not move into research and publication quickly enough.

- We are budgeted from an enrollment driven model.
- There is a desire for the faculty to engage in research and writing as well as teaching. The concern is from an administrative point of view, primarily.
- It is the quality, rather than the level of productivity, that concerns us most.
- Yes, in the sense that productivity is related to the quality of faculty and is an indication that the faculty is active, aggressive, and excellent.

Definition of Faculty Productivity:

The questionnaire provided two definitions of faculty productivity and respondents were asked to mark the one which best described their institution's definition. If neither of the two were appropriate, respondents were asked to provide a definition. Slightly more than half (52.3%) responded that the best definition for them was "faculty productivity represents the sum of all activities which are related either directly or indirectly to professional duties, responsibilities, and interests." Another 38.5% responded that they defined it as "the sum of only those activities which are related directly to professional duties, responsibilities, and interests." Only 9.2% indicated that they had a different definition. These definitions included:

- The sum of those assigned activities related directly to professional duties and responsibilities.
- Service, teaching, and scholarship.

° Credit hours generated: class enrollment multiplied by semester hours taught.

It might be concluded then that, of the two definitions provided, the most frequently used definition of productivity is the sum of all activities which are related either directly or indirectly to professional duties, responsibilities, and interests. This is true for both levels of colleges surveyed. The data showed no statistical significance between the two levels.

TEACHING LOADS

Full-time Teaching Loads:

There was a significant difference found in the full-time teaching load between doctoral and non-doctoral granting colleges at all levels of academic rank, with the full-time teaching loads being higher in non-doctoral colleges. Six (6) quarter hours is listed most often as the normal full-time teaching load for faculty in all academic ranks in the doctoral granting colleges, with the range between 4 and 12 quarter hours. At the non-doctoral granting colleges, 8 or 9 hours was indicated most frequently, followed closely by 12 hours, for all academic ranks. Most of the non-doctoral colleges indicated the load within a range of 8 - 15 quarter hours.

Index for Teaching Loads:

For all colleges, credit hour is the most frequently used index in measuring teaching loads, as indicated by 49.2% of the respondents.

The indices used next most frequently were a combination of contact and credit hours (15.9%) and contact hours (11.1%). Although not significantly different, 58.3% of the doctoral granting colleges were using credit hours, as compared to 43.6% of the non-doctoral granting colleges. The second most frequently used index in the doctoral granting colleges was weighted student credit hours (16.7%), and in the non-doctoral granting colleges, a combination of contact/ credit hours ranked second with 23.1%.

Work-load Specifications:

Less than one-third (32.8%) of the colleges responded that they use faculty letters of assignment or contracts which delineate specific duties and/or expectations of productivity. A slightly higher percentage of non-doctoral granting colleges (35.0%) responded that they do delineate faculty expectations, compared to doctoral granting colleges (29.2%). Although only 11 (17.2%) of the respondents indicated that they had state or union statutes designating faculty work load and/or work time, 12 of the institutions (18.8%) responded that the faculty was unionized. A slightly higher percentage (22.5%) of the non-doctoral granting colleges were unionized than were the doctoral level colleges (12.5%).

Off-campus Teaching:

Less than one-half of the respondents (40.3%) indicated that

they offer off-campus undergraduate courses, with 45.5% of the doctoral granting colleges indicating they do, as compared to 37.5% of the non-doctoral granting colleges. Five of the institutions (8.1%) said that they used a different formula for calculating production based on off-campus undergraduate courses, usually considering these courses as overloads for faculty for which there is extra compensation.

There was a significant difference by type of college as to whether graduate courses were offered off-campus or not. Two-thirds (66.7%) of the doctoral granting colleges responded that they do offer graduate courses off-campus, as compared to 47.5% of the non-doctoral granting colleges. In addition, a larger percentage of the doctoral granting colleges (20.8%) indicated that they used a different formula in calculating productivity for these courses than did non-doctoral granting colleges (7.5%). Here again, the difference formula was primarily in considering off-campus as overloads for which extra compensation was granted. One institution responded that although no difference was made in on-campus vs. off-campus for undergraduate courses, for graduate courses the faculty are given additional load credit per course, amounting to 1 1/2 times as much credit for an off-campus as one taught on-campus. Another college reported that there was a difference in the allowance of travel time for vocational education instructors.

PRODUCTIVITY CALCULATIONS

Faculty Classifications Used in Productivity Calculations:

As can be seen by the breakdown in Table I, the data show that regular faculty members, either full-time or part-time, and academic administrators are used in productivity calculations more than are individuals in the other classifications. Faculty assigned to contracts and/or grants are used approximately one-half of the time, and hire-behinds are used least often in the calculations. The data indicate that doctoral granting colleges are more likely to use part-time faculty, academic administrators, and faculty assigned to contracts and/or grants on a regular basis than will non-doctoral granting colleges.

Productivity Aggregation:

The questionnaire asked how often productivity data are aggregated by several classifications. The responses indicate that all of the classifications listed are used at some time by some of the institutions. Aggregations are done most frequently by individual faculty member, followed by college and by department. Used less frequently are aggregations by faculty FTE and by teaching specialization. In addition, aggregations are done most often on an annual basis, rather than by semester/quarter.

The crosstabulation by type of college indicated that there was a significant difference as to how often aggregations are made by

TABLE I

FACULTY CLASSIFICATIONS IN PRODUCTIVITY CALCULATIONS
FREQUENCY OF USE

	Always Used %	Sometimes Used %	Never Used %
Full-time faculty			
Doctoral	91.3	4.3	4.3
Non-doctoral	92.1	5.3	2.6
All	91.8	4.9	3.3
Part-time faculty			
Doctoral	75.0	25.0	0
Non-doctoral	56.8	53.1	8.1
All	63.2	31.6	5.3
Adjunct			
Doctoral	42.1	36.8	21.1
Non-doctoral	32.3	54.8	12.9
All	36.0	48.0	16.0
Visiting faculty			
Doctoral	42.1	26.3	31.6
Non-doctoral	33.3	40.0	26.7
All	36.7	34.7	28.6
Faculty assigned to contracts and/or grants			
Doctoral	66.7	28.6	4.8
Non-doctoral	46.7	33.3	20.0
All	54.9	31.4	13.7
Hire-behinds			
Doctoral	35.3	35.3	29.4
Non-doctoral	32.0	44.0	24.0
All	33.3	40.5	26.2
Academic administrators			
Doctoral	70.0	20.0	10.0
Non-doctoral	51.5	36.4	12.1
All	58.5	30.2	11.3

individual faculty member. Over three-fourths of the doctoral granting colleges (78.3%) do individual faculty member aggregations on an annual basis, while nearly one-half (42.9%) of the non-doctoral granting colleges do it on a semester basis.

Frequency of Gathering Data:

Several sources of productivity data were listed and the respondents were asked to indicate how often the sources were used by their institutions. All of the sources listed are used by all the responding institutions either on a semester or an annual basis. Overall, the source most often used is administrative reviews, followed by student evaluations and faculty self-reports. The sources used least frequently are faculty peer reviews and institutional records. Table II indicates the source and the percentage of use by all institutions.

FACTORS IN DECISION MAKING

Teaching, Research, or Service in Decisions:

The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which teaching, research, or service is used in making decisions about tenure, promotion, salary increases, and retention of faculty when cutbacks are considered. Overall, research is indicated as being a more important factor in all the decisions in doctoral granting colleges than it is in non-doctoral granting colleges, while teaching is more important in the non-doctoral granting colleges. Significant differences

TABLE II

FREQUENCY OF GATHERING DATA
BY SOURCE

	Quarter/ Semester %	Annual %	Not Used %
Faculty self-reports	19.3	64.9	15.8
Faculty peer review	*	56.3	41.7
Administrative review	16.9	76.3	5.1
Student evaluations	55.4	30.4	7.1
Institutional records	25.0	52.1	20.8

* Not used on semester basis

in the crosstabulations on this section were found in the area of research, with a much larger percentage of doctoral granting colleges indicating research as extremely important than was true for non-doctoral granting colleges when decisions are made. Service also tends to be more important in the doctoral granting colleges, when the percentage of extremely important responses are considered. The rankings for each category by level of college are given in Table III.

Factors Used in Merit Evaluation of Faculty:

The question of quantity vs. quality in research, teaching, and service was treated by asking how important each of six factors is in merit evaluation consideration. Based on the rankings, quality is considered to be more important than quantity for each of the six factors. The data analysis indicated significant differences between the level of colleges with regard to the quality of research and quality of service. For quality of research, 68.2% of the doctoral granting colleges indicate that it is extremely important, as compared to 6.5% of the non-doctoral colleges. Similarly, 50.0% of the doctoral granting colleges indicate that quality of service is extremely important, compared to 17.6% of the non-doctoral colleges. When the factor was perceived to be "extremely critical," the rank order by level of college was:

TABLE III

FACTORS IN DECISION MAKING
BY RANK AND LEVEL OF COLLEGE

	Doctoral Level	Non-Doctoral Level	All
Tenure Decisions			
1.	Research	Teaching	Teaching
2.	Teaching	Service	Research
3.	Service	Research	Service
Promotion Decisions			
1.	Research	Teaching	Teaching
2.	Teaching	Service	Research
3.	Service	Research	Service
Salary Increase Decisions			
1.	Research	Teaching	Teaching
2.	Teaching	Research and Service	Research
3.	Service		Service
Retention When Cutbacks Are Considered			
1.	Teaching	Teaching	Teaching
2.	Research	Service	Service
3.	Service	Research	Research

Note: Service was defined by many respondents as "length of employment," especially when retention was a decision to be made.

Doctoral granting colleges:

1. Quality of research
2. Quality of teaching
3. Quality of service
4. Quantity of research
5. Quantity of teaching
6. Quantity of service

Non-doctoral granting colleges:

1. Quality of teaching
2. Quantity of teaching
3. Quality of service
4. Quantity of service
5. Quantity of research
6. Quality of research

When the institutions were asked to indicate which combinations of research, teaching, and service would be rewarded more highly, 29.1% of all the respondents indicated that a combination of service and teaching would be rewarded more highly, followed by 25.5% saying that it would be a combination of teaching and research. There was a significant difference between the level of college and the combinations, with 47.6% of the doctoral granting colleges indicating a combination of teaching and research, as compared to 11.8% of the non-doctoral colleges. At the same time, 47.1% of the non-doctoral granting colleges and none of the doctoral granting colleges indicated that it would be a combination of service and teaching.

Importance of Factors in Estimating Productivity:

Forth-six different factors were identified from the literature as those which might be considered in estimating faculty productivity.

These factors were then divided into five (5) different categories (instructional, research and scholarship, institutional service, public service, and professional development) and the respondents were asked to indicate the level of consideration given to each factor within each category. Two different rankings were developed for each category: (1) by "of major consideration" and (2) by combining "considered to a large extent" with "of major consideration." (The ranks for each of the categories are given in the tables at the end of the report.)

Instructional Factors:

"Student credit hours" was indicated as being the most important factor in estimating faculty productivity in the instructional category for all colleges and for doctoral granting colleges, while the "number of classes taught" was the most important factor in non-doctoral granting colleges. When only "of major consideration" is used, the top five ranked factors by level of college were:

Doctoral granting colleges:

1. Student credit hours
2. Level of course taught
3.5 Number of classes taught
3.5 Level of student taught
6. Student contact (in class)
6. Mode of class presentation
6. Number of class preparations

Non-doctoral granting colleges:

1. Number of classes taught

2. Student credit hours
3. Student contact (in class)
4. Student/faculty ratio
5. Time of course taught

Significant differences between the level of colleges were found in four of the instructional factors: (1) "in class contact hours," (2) "time of course," (3) "level of advisee," and (4) "level of advisee graduating." "In class contact hours" was considered more important at non-doctoral granting colleges than it was in doctoral granting colleges, while the other three factors were more important at the doctoral granting colleges.

Research and Scholarship Factors:

"Single authored books" was viewed as the most important research and scholarship factor by all the colleges, whether considered by level or collectively. Second in importance was "single authored articles," followed by "funded research" and "joint authored books" in third place. Although the rankings for research and scholarship factors are very similar, the data indicate that research is much more important at doctoral granting colleges than in non-doctoral colleges. Significant differences between the two levels were found in all but three of the factors: non-funded research, manuals, and in-house reports/publications. A higher percentage of "major consideration" responses was given on seven (7) of the factors by doctoral granting colleges than was given to any factor by the non-doctoral colleges. For example, "book chapters or segments" ranked

seventh for the doctoral granting colleges, with 20.8% of the respondents saying it would be a major consideration. At the same time, the first ranked factor for the non-doctoral colleges, "single authored books," had only 19.4% of the respondents indicating that it would be a major consideration.

Public Service Factors:

As with research and scholarship factors, public service factors tend to be given more consideration in estimating faculty productivity at the doctoral granting colleges than at the non-doctoral colleges. Although only one significance by level of college was found (non-paid consulting being more important at the doctoral granting colleges), a higher percentage of "major consideration" responses was given on six (6) of the factors by doctoral granting colleges than was given to any factor by the non-doctoral colleges.

"Holding office in professional organizations" and "editing professional journals" are equally considered the most important public service factor for doctoral granting colleges. For non-doctoral colleges and for all colleges, "editing professional journals" is ranked as the most important service factor, with "holding office in professional organizations" in second place. For the non-doctoral colleges, service activities (community and state) and giving speeches are all tied for second place.

Institutional Service Factors:

"Serving on institutional/college committees" and "chairing institutional/college committees" are the two most important institutional service factors when considered by level of college or collectively. In fact, these are the only two factors which the doctoral granting colleges indicated would be given "major consideration" in estimating faculty productivity.

The responses indicate that none of the institutional service factors are really very important. For example, the first ranked factor, "chairing institutional/college committees," only had 21.7% of the doctoral granting colleges, 13.0% of the non-doctoral colleges, and 16.4% of all the colleges indicating that it would be of major consideration.

Professional Development Factors:

The data indicate that professional development factors are not really considered in estimating faculty productivity. Only 7.9% of the non-doctoral granting colleges and 4.2% of the doctoral colleges indicated that "attending meetings and/or conventions" was a major consideration, and only 7.9% of the non-doctoral colleges and none of the doctoral colleges responded that "taking courses" would be of major consideration.

All Productivity Factors:

When the forty-six different factors which might be considered in estimating faculty productivity are combined to determine which ones received the highest percentages of responses indicating importance, it becomes very apparent that research and scholarship factors are more important in doctoral granting colleges, while teaching is more important in the non-doctoral level colleges. For example, when the top five factors by level of college are ranked by percentage responses of "major consideration," they show:

Doctoral granting colleges:

1. Single authored books (50.0%)
2. Single authored articles (37.5%)
3.5 Holding office in professional organizations (33.3%)
3.5 Editing professional journals (33.3%)
6. Student credit hours (29.2%)
6. Funded research (29.2%)
6. Joint authored books (29.2%)

Non-doctoral colleges:

1. Number of classes taught (32.4%)
2. Student credit hours (28.2%)
3. Single authored books (19.4%)
4. Student contact (in class) (18.9%)
5. Student/faculty ratio (16.2%)

When all the factors are considered using a combination of "considered to a large extent" and "of major consideration" percentages, the results indicate even more the differences in doctoral and non-doctoral granting colleges. Based on the combined percentages, the top ranked factors are:

Doctoral granting colleges:

2.5 Single authored articles (87.5%)

2.5 Joint authored articles (87.5%)
2.5 Single authored books (87.5%)
2.5 Joint authored books (87.5%)
5. Non-funded research (84.1%)

Non-doctoral granting colleges:

1. Number of classes taught (75.6%)
2. Student credit hours (66.7%)
3.5 Serving on institutional/college committees (65.8%)
3.5 Chairing institutional/college committees (65.8%)
5. Student contact (in class) (64.8%)

METHODS BEING USED TO INCREASE FACULTY PRODUCTIVITY

Many ways were mentioned by the institutions as being used to increase faculty productivity by their college and/or institution. Few, if any, could be classified as innovative. Many of the methods involved the expenditure of monies or the equivalent, such as funding research projects, providing in-service short courses, and providing editorial and grant writing assistance. Several of the colleges identified "merit pay" as the basic method being used, along with having the faculty involved in the development of merit pay/increase plans.

A few interesting methods were identified; interesting primarily because of how they were stated. These included:

° Attempting to get more students.

° Reducing the staff while the enrollment is increasing.

° Exhortation.

° Training faculty to enter other professions.

° Attrition and reassignment.

° Having faculty compete for awards, sabbaticals, professional development funds.

In addition, a large number of colleges said that they were employing professional editors to assist faculty members in preparing articles for publication, including editing and preparing final copy at no cost to the faculty member. Several colleges have individuals on their staff who are trained in "grantsmanship" to assist faculty in the competition for research monies.

Although many specific statements were made concerning methods of increasing faculty productivity, the following general categories were those mentioned most frequently:

1. Implementing performance reviews for salary increases, promotion and tenure, and professional development based on professional growth contracts and clear letters of appointment with delineation of expectations.

2. Sabbaticals, research fellowships, faculty exchange programs, release time for research, tuition wavers.

3. Merit pay plans and merit rating systems.

4. Professional development activities, including in-service short courses (i.e., computing, grant writing, instructional improvement).

5. Financial support for professional travel, research, consulting, etc.

6. Psychic rewards, including publicizing faculty activities, distinguished service awards, teaching awards, and other forms of peer approval and recognition.

7. Curricular and program changes, including elimination of selected academic programs and the creation of new areas of instruction, program reviews, and cancelling low enrollment classes.

8. Systematizing the collection of productivity data, particularly:

   A. Collecting data on off-campus, non-paid service activities.

   B. Developing productivity formulas.

   C. Studying the feasibility of off-campus teaching being on-load.

9. Alternative utilization of personnel, including reassignment and re-education.

10. Staff support for publications, grant writing, etc.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the data provided by 65 Colleges of Education across the nation, including 41 non-doctoral granting colleges and 24 doctoral granting colleges, the following conclusions are made:

1. Faculty productivity and faculty evaluation are a concern at most of the colleges, with the primary sources of concern being perceived as coming from College/University Administration, State Council/ Legislature, or faculty members.

2. The most frequently used definition of productivity is "the sum of all activities which are related either directly or indirectly to professional duties, responsibilities, and interests."

3. Six quarter hours is considered the normal full-time teaching load for faculty in all academic ranks in the doctoral granting colleges, with 8 or 9 hours considered the normal full-time teaching load for faculty in all academic ranks in the non-doctoral granting colleges.

4. The credit hour is the most frequently used index in measuring teaching loads.

5. Faculty work load and/or work time is not normally specified in letters of assignment or contracts, although the practice of delineating duties is more frequent in non-doctoral granting colleges than doctoral colleges.

6. Off-campus teaching is frequently considered an overload for which faculty are usually compensated over and above their regular salary.

7. Regular faculty members, either full-time or part-time, and academic administrators are the most common categories used in calculating faculty productivity.

8. Aggregation of productivity data is most frequently done by individual faculty member, by college, and by department and aggregations are most often done on an annual basis.

9. Most of the significant differences between doctoral and non-doctoral granting colleges were directly related to the factor of "research." The data indicate that "research" is a much more important factor in all types of decisions concerning tenure, promotion, and salary increases at doctoral granting colleges than it is in non-doctoral granting colleges.

10. When reductions in force are considered, "teaching" is the most important factor considered by all types of colleges. In addition, "service" is frequently defined as the "length of employment" or "seniority" when cutbacks in staff are considered.

11. In the merit evaluation of faculty, quality is more important than quantity. The quality of research is the most important factor in doctoral granting colleges, while the quality of teaching is indicated as the most important factor in non-doctoral granting colleges.

12. Overall, a combination of teaching and service is the most highly rewarded of any combination of research, service, and teaching, followed closely by a combination of teaching and research. The data indicated a significant difference between the level of

college, with the doctoral granting colleges indicating a combination of teaching and research as the most important and non-doctoral colleges indicating that the most important combination would be service and teaching.

13. "Student credit hours" is indicated as being the most important instructional factor in estimating faculty productivity for all colleges and for doctoral granting colleges, while the "number of classes taught" is the most important factor in non-doctoral granting colleges.

14. "Single authored books" is viewed as the most important research and scholarship factor in estimating faculty productivity, followed by "single authored articles," "funded research," and "joint authored books."

15. Overall, "editing professional journals" is ranked as the most important public service factor in estimating faculty productivity, with "holding office in professional organizations" ranked second.

16. Institutional service factors are not very important when estimating faculty productivity. However, when they are considered, "chairing institutional/college committees" is indicated as the most important.

17. The data indicated that professional development factors are not considered important in estimating faculty productivity.

18. When all productivity factors listed in the questionnaire are considered for all the colleges, the five most important factors in estimating faculty productivity are:

    - Single authored books
    - Student credit hours
    - Number of classes taught
    - Single authored articles
    - Editing professional journals

19. There are no new, innovative methods being used by the colleges to increase faculty productivity.

20. There is a conflict in the data which is evidenced by the fact that the colleges rank "student credit hours" as the most important instructional factor and "single authored books" as the most important research factor in measuring productivity. However, when quality vs. quantity is considered for merit evaluation of the faculty, quality is perceived to be more important. Therefore, productivity is based on "numbers," while merit evaluations are based on "perceived quality."

APPENDIX I

Tables

TABLE 1

INSTRUCTIONAL FACTORS IN ESTIMATING
PRODUCTIVITY FOR DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Student credit hours	6
2	Level of course taught	7
3.5	Number of classes taught	1
3.5	Level of student taught	8
6	Student contact (in class)	12
6	Mode of presentation	16
6	Number of class preparations	9.5
11	Student/faculty ratio	14
11	Number of students taught	3.5
11	Subject matter taught	18
11	Level of advisees graduating	12
11	Individual instruction	9.5
13	Level of student advisees	3.5
14	Student contact (outside class)	17
19	Class preparation time	15
19	Number of student advisees	3.5
19	Number of advisees graduating	13
19	Number of new class preparations	3.5
19	Location of course taught	19
*	Time course taught	*

*No responses

TABLE 2

INSTRUCTIONAL FACTORS IN ESTIMATING
PRODUCTIVITY FOR NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Number of classes taught	1
2	Student credit hours	2
3	Student contact (in class)	3
4	Student/faculty ratio	6
5	Time of course taught	19
6.5	Number of students taught	4
6.5	Number of class preparations	5
8	Number of new class preparations	9
9.5	Student contact (outside class)	14
9.5	Level of advisee graduating	16
12	Level of student taught	8
12	Level of course taught	7
12	Mode of presentation	13
14	Subject matter taught	11
15.5	Location of course taught	20
15.5	Number of advisees graduating	18
18	Class preparation time	17
18	Level of student advisees	15
18	Number of student advisees	12
*	Individual instruction	10

*No responses

TABLE 3

INSTRUCTIONAL FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR ALL COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Student credit hours	2
2	Number of classes taught	1
3	Student contact (in class)	4
4	Student/faculty ratio	9
5	Level of course taught	6
6	Level of student taught	8
7	Number of class preparations	5
8.5	Mode of presentation	14
8.5	Number of students taught	3
10	Level of advisees graduating	15
12	Number of new class preparations	7
12	Subject matter taught	13
12	Student contact (outside class)	16
14	Time of course taught	20
15	Level of student advisees	12
16.5	Location of course taught	19
16.5	Number of advisees graduating	17
19	Class preparation time	18
19	Number of student advisees	10
19	Individual instruction	11

TABLE 4

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Single authored books	2.5
2	Single authored articles	2.5
3.5	Joint authored books	2.5
3.5	Funded research	7
5.5	Joint authored articles	2.5
5.5	Edited books	8
7	Book segments or chapters	6
8	Monographs	5
9	Manuals	10
10	Non-funded research	9
*	In-house reports/publications	11

*No responses

TABLE 5

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Single authored books	1
2	Single authored articles	2.5
3.5	Joint authored books	2.5
3.5	Funded research	7
5.5	Manuals	9
5.5	In-house reports/publications	11
9	Non-funded research	10
9	Joint authored articles	5
9	Edited books	7
9	Book chapters or segments	7
9	Monographs	4

TABLE 6

RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR ALL COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Single authored books	1
2	Single authored articles	2.5
3.5	Funded research	7
3.5	Joint authored books	2.5
5.5	Joint authored articles	4
5.5	Edited books published	8
7	Book segments/chapters	6
8	Monographs	5
9	Manuals	10
10	Non-funded research	9
11	In-house reports/publications	11

TABLE 7

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Chairing institutional/ college committees	1
2	Serving on institutional/ college committees	2
*	General administrative functions	3
*	Student service activities	4
*	Attending meetings	5
*	Attending institutional functions	6

* No responses

TABLE 8

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Chairing institutional/ college committees	1.5
2	Serving on institutional/ college committees	1.5
3	Attending institutional functions	6
4.5	Student service activities	5
4.5	General administrative functions	3
6	Attending meetings	4

TABLE 9

INSTITUTIONAL SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR ALL COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Chairing institutional/ college committees	1
2	Serving on institutional/ college committees	2
3	Attending institutional functions	6
5	Student service activities	4
5	General administrative functions	3
5	Attending meetings	5

TABLE 10

PUBLIC SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING
PRODUCTIVITY FOR DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1.5	Holding office in professional organizations	1.5
1.5	Editing professional journals	1.5
3	Service within state	4
4	Giving speeches outside institution	5
5	Service within community	6
6	Non-paid consulting	3
7	Paid consulting	7

TABLE 11

PUBLIC SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING
PRODUCTIVITY FOR NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Editing professional journals	1.5
3	Service within community	4
3	Service within state	3
3	Giving speeches outside institution	5
5	Holding office in professional organization	1.5
*	Paid consulting	7
*	Non-paid consulting	6

* No responses

TABLE 12

PUBLIC SERVICE FACTORS IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY FOR ALL COLLEGES

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
1	Editing professional journals	2
2	Holding office in professional organization	1
3	Service within state	3
4	Giving speeches outside institution	6
5	Service within community	4
6	Non-paid consulting	5
7	Paid consulting	7

TABLE 13

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT FACTORS
IN ESTIMATING PRODUCTIVITY

Major Consideration Rank		Large Extent & Major Consideration Rank
	FOR DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES	
1	Attending meetings/conventions	1
*	Taking courses	2
	FOR NON-DOCTORAL GRANTING COLLEGES	
1.5	Attending meetings/conventions	2
1.5	Taking courses	1
	FOR ALL COLLEGES	
1	Attending meetings/conventions	2
2	Taking courses	1

* No responses

APPENDIX B

Additional Comments
or
Information

PRODUCTIVITY INDICES

1. Equalized Credit Hours: converts credit hours to faculty load hours for labs, field work or other exceptions to on-campus traditional schedules of faculty. For example:

    - 15 contact hours equals 1 student credit hour.
    - 15 or 16 hours in a school on a contracted basis equals .5 student credit hours.
    - 4 hours of planning and/or follow-up for off-campus service activity equals .5 student credit hours.

2. Each advanced/doctoral course is considered equal to 1.33 of undergraduate, master's, and lower level doctoral course.

3. Graduate courses considered equal to 1.5 of undergraduate course.

ADDITIONAL PRODUCTIVITY FACTORS CONSIDERED

1. Instructional:

    A. Dissertations supervised
    B. Being there - class, wherever

2. Public Service:

    A. Foreign service
    B. Consulting in the area of specialization

3. Professional Development:

    A. Giving papers to/before learned groups
    B. Academic degrees/schooling
    C. Special workshops

COMMENTS ON DECISION MAKING

1. Unionized Faculty:

A. This is not applicable. There is a state salary guide for steps and increments. Merit awards are not given.

B. We are unionized with the clause of last on/first out.

C. According to AAUP contract, salary and reduction in force is based on seniority. Salary adjustments can be made for promotion in rank.

D. We have physical constraints on the number of hours taught for full-time faculty, based on union contract.

E. The University does not have academic ranks. Salary increases are governed by collective bargaining agreement.

F. Salaries are negotiated by the union and mandated.

G. Faculty union contract precludes promotion or raises based on productivity or merit. Advancement and/or retrenchment may be based on seniority only.

2. General:

A. Faculty can choose teaching plus one other to specialize in, as long as they are at least adequate in the third. (Responding to question of service, teaching, and research or combinations thereof.)

B. Tenure and length of service are important factors considered in reduction in force decisions.